



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## Notes and Opinions.

**A New Interpretation of Gal. 3:19, 20.**—Dean Campbell, of England, in a recent volume entitled *Studies in Biblical and Ecclesiastical Subjects*, attempts to find a satisfactory meaning for this passage, which the Revised Version does not illuminate, and the current interpretation of which does not seem to be final. Who is "the mediator" to whom Paul refers? Is it Moses, according to prevalent understanding, or some one else? Dean Campbell regards Christ as "the mediator" referred to, and his interpretation therefore reads: "It (the Law) was ordained (or *administered*) through angels by the hand of a mediator. Now this (the) mediator is not a mediator of one (covenant); but God is one." What he understands the apostle to say is that the Law was administered through angels, but by the hand or power of a mediator, and that this mediator, being Christ himself, was thus the mediator not of the Promise only, but of the Law also. For the Law and the Promise are not antagonistic; neither is the Law antagonistic to the better covenant that is to follow. Christ is the Mediator or Intercessor between God and man under the Law as under the Promise and under the Gospel. There is but one Person with whom man has ever to do. There is but one Mediator between them. And as it is the same God always, so also is it always the same Mediator. Or, as the apostle again, and very plainly, puts it to Timothy: "For there is one God, one mediator also between God and men, himself man, Christ Jesus" (1 Tim. 2:5). The *Expository Times* for March discusses the passage, and Dean Campbell's interpretation of it, at some length editorially, and from that the above paragraph is taken. The new conception of the passage deserves consideration.

**The Trinitarian Baptismal Formula, Matt. 28:19.**—Dr. Resch, in his recent *Aussercanonische Paralleltex te zu den Evangelien*, has something to say upon this subject. It is given in brief by Professor J. T. Marshall, in reviewing Dr. Resch's book in the *Critical Review* for January, with the comment that it "is perhaps the most valuable piece of work in the whole volume." Dr. Resch says substantially: "It seems to be regarded as an axiom in some theological circles that these words ('baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost') cannot be the literal words of the Lord Jesus, but are 'a comparatively late product of the dogmatic development of the church.'" But Dr. Resch gives fourteen pages of quotations from very early Christian literature, orthodox and heretical, showing the universal use of this formula. After this collection of evidence he sums up the arguments for the authenticity of the words as follows: (1)

In the ministry of John the Baptist the trinitarian conception is discernible : " God is able from these stones," etc. ; " He that cometh after me is mightier than I ;" " He shall baptize in the Holy Spirit." (2) The trinitarian parallels in apostolic writings to be considered in another work not yet published. (3) Quotations from the oldest patristic literature, beginning with Clement of Rome, who has three palpably trinitarian passages, of which one is, " We have one God and one Christ and one Spirit of Grace who was shed upon us." Ignatius has four passages equally explicit. Then comes the *Didaché*, which gives us the earliest citation of the baptismal formula outside the canon, " Baptize ye into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," and quotations from many others. (4) The most striking proof of the veritable authenticity of the words is the prevalence of the trinitarian baptismal formula amongst all heretical sects—even among sects whose tenets were not in accord with its implied teaching. This shows how deeply the trinitarian confession of faith is rooted in primitive Christianity. For example, among the Jewish Christians, where a unitarian rather than a trinitarian conception of God is discernible, as in the so-called Clementine Homilies, the trinitarian baptismal formula nevertheless was in constant use. The tendency of doctrine among them was foreign, nay hostile, to trinitarianism, but the " trina invocatio " was too venerable to be dispensed with. Similarly, in the Gnostic systems the triad of Matthew 28 : 19 plays an important part ; and even the perverse Gnostics used the trinitarian baptismal formula for their sacrament of initiation, " manifestly only in order that they might not altogether lose connection with the common consciousness of the church and the right of the Christian name." Monarchianism, Montanism, Manichæism, however hostile they were to the trinitarian conception of God, never repudiated the baptismal formula ; and this could only be because it had existed from the beginning. No one could assign a moment in the development of the church when this tradition did not exist. It was the bond of union between all who claimed the Christian name.

Professor Marshall's review, from which the above summary of Dr. Resch's discussion is taken, contains in brief the ideas of the author on several other interesting points, such as the composition of the Gospel of Mark, the composition of the Gospel of Matthew, the *Logia*, the text of certain Gospel passages, Matthew's eschatological discourse, and the connection between Paul and the synoptic Gospels. What Dr. Resch thinks upon these and all the themes presented in his book one cannot afford to be ignorant of, and that they are in general sufficiently conservative is suggested by his defense of the trinitarian baptismal formula.

**Beyschlag's Conception of the Person of Christ.**—Professor Beyschlag, whose *New Testament Theology* has just appeared in an English translation (2 vols., Scribners), is one of Germany's most important and influential New Testament scholars. He was born in 1823, and since 1860 has been professor of

theology at Halle. He has recently published a *Life of Jesus (Leben Jesu)*, which has not been translated. He belongs to the middle school, avoiding at the same time extreme conservatism and extreme radicalism. He believes in "the revealed character of biblical religion, and the historical character of the biblical revelation." He accepts the Johannine authorship of the fourth Gospel, but regards the Pastoral Epistles, 2 Peter and Jude as belonging to a later period than that to which conservative scholars assign them. His *New Testament Theology* is an unusually able and valuable contribution to the subject, ranking with those of Weiss, Wendt, Bruce, Stevens and, lately, in France, Bovon. A recent review of his *Theology* published in Great Britain, of which Professor Banks was the author, criticised unfavorably, from a conservative point of view, Professor Beyschlag's conception of the Person of Christ. Other reviewers accused him of Unitarian views about Jesus. The following letter (translated from German into English) was sent by Dr. Beyschlag to the English publishers of his *New Testament Theology*, and states more concisely, if not more precisely, his conception of the Person of Christ:

"Notwithstanding the favorable opinion of the *Scotsman* reviewer, in other respects, his statement that my conception of biblical Christianity is virtually what is known in England as Unitarianism, is as objectionable to me as it is to you. On this point I should like to make an explanation, of which you are at liberty to make what public use you please.

"In view of my accentuation of the Monotheism of the Bible and of the true and full humanity of Christ, I can easily understand how a critic, even though favorably disposed, should regard the fundamental view of my *New Testament Theology* as Unitarian. Nevertheless this is a serious misunderstanding.

"The Christology which I find in the New Testament is virtually that of Schleiermacher, whom no one in Germany has ever classed as a Unitarian or Socinian. Unitarianism places an impassable *gulf* between God and man, whilst I see in Christ the perfect *union* of the two, the incarnation of God. I do not, indeed, reach this conclusion in accordance with the usual orthodox scheme, which makes a second person of the Godhead unite himself with an impersonal human nature, and thus produces a Being who is half God and half man, or is really a second God in an apparently human form. Like Schleiermacher, I begin with the certain and historical facts concerning Christ, namely, his *humanity*, and conceive him as the typical and ideal man. He is so, however, only in virtue of the absolute indwelling of God in him, for only the man who is absolutely one with God is the ideal man. And therefore I regard Christ, in contradistinction to all his brethren, as that true and perfect man 'in whom dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily' (Col. 1:19; 2:9). This Christology presupposes a Trinity of God, and one that is not merely æconomical, but also ontological. For it is an essential part of God's *nature*, that he can at once remain eternally *above* us as God the Father, enter into humanity in Christ, and make his abode in the heart as

Holy Spirit. That, of course, is not a trinity of 'Persons'—an idea which was opposed even by St. Augustine, and which in accordance with the modern idea of personality directly leads to three Gods—but a threefold mode of being of the One God, three *modi*, three *relationes subsistentes*. In thus conceiving God, I am, like Schleiermacher, a Modalistic Trinitarian, but not a Unitarian.

"My *New Testament Theology*, however, was not the place in which to speak of this conception of the Trinity, as the New Testament has no formal doctrine on the subject, but only the elements of such a doctrine, and these I have pointed out in their proper place (see, for example, Vol. II., p. 88 f.).

"This explanation should be sufficient to clear up any misunderstanding on this point on the part of those who are versed in the subject.

(Signed)

DR. WILLIBALD BEYSCHLAG."